



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)
Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional): 8285-375

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail **EV964284993US** in an envelope addressed to: "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" (37 CFR 1.8(a)).
On October 12, 2007.

Signature

Typed or printed

Name Scott W. Brim

Application Number:

09/741,734

Filed:

December 19, 2000

First Named Inventor: Dianna I. Tiliks et al.

Art Unit:

2617

Examiner: Miller, Brandon J.

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five(5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.

See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)

☒ attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 51,500

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Signature

Scott W. Brim

Typed or Printed Name

312 321-4200

Telephone number

Note: Signatures of all inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.*

October 12, 2007

Date

☒ *Total of 1 forms are submitted.



"Express Mail" Mailing Label No. Ev964284993US

October 12, 2007

Date of Deposit

Attorney Docket No. 8285/375

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
)	
Dianna I. Tiliks et al.)	
Serial No.:)	Examiner: Miller, Brandon J.
09/741,734)	
Filing Date:)	Group Art Unit No.: 2617
December 19, 2000)	
For:)	
METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR)	
DUAL RINGING OF A CENTREX)	
LINE AND A WIRELESS)	
EXTENSION OF THE CENTREX)	
LINE)	

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandra, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application.
No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal

The review is requested for the reasons stated on the attached sheets. No more than five (5) pages are provided.

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action dated July 17, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,963,864 ("O'Neil") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,970,719 ("McConnell"). Applicants respectfully request review of the final rejection.

II. The References Fail to Teach Initiating a First Call to a Wireless Extension of a Centrex Line and a Second Call to the Centrex Line

Independent claims 1 and 5 recite initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrex line and a second call to the Centrex line. O'Neil and McConnell both fail to teach at least this element.

O'Neil is directed to a method and system for automatically connecting telephone calls to multiple devices having different directory numbers. In O'Neil, a subscriber may associate a telephone number of a wireless device with a telephone number of a wireline number so that when a call is placed to the wireline number, a first call may be initiated to the wireless device and a second call may be initiated to the wireline number. The Examiner has admitted that O'Neil fails to teach a Centrex line. O'Neil additionally fails to teach initiating a call to a wireline number and initiating another call to a wireless extension of the wireline number. In O'Neil, the telephone number of the wireless device is not a wireless extension of the wireline number, but is simply a separate telephone number of a wireless device that a user has associated with the wireline number. Thus, O'Neil necessarily does not disclose initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrex line and a second call to the Centrex line.

Like O'Neil, McConnell also fails to teach initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrex line and a second call to the Centrex line. McConnell is directed to a private wireless network integrated with a public wireless network. In McConnell, a mobile device may be used as a cellular phone when outside a private network wireless coverage, and be used as an extension of a Centrex line when within the private network wireless coverage. However, McConnell does not teach dual ringing such that when a telephone call is placed to a Centrex line, a service node initiates a first call to a

wireless extension of the Centrex line and a second call to the Centrex line. In McConnell, a call is only initiated to the mobile device. Therefore, while McConnell may teach a mobile device that may act as an extension of a Centrex line, McConnell fails to teach initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrex line and a second call to the Centrex line.

Because O'Neil and McConnell both fail to teach at least initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrex line and a second call to the Centrex line, the proposed combination of O'Neil and McConnell necessarily does not render independent claims 1 and 5, or any claims that depends on claims 1 and 5, unpatentable.

III. The Proposed Combination Does Not Render Claim 15 Unpatentable

Independent claim 15 recites a service node coupled with a service signal point, the service node operative to initiate a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrex line and a second call to the Centrex line in response to the wireless extension of the Centrex line being available. O'Neil and McConnell both fail to teach a service node initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrex line and a second call to the Centrex line. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of O'Neil and McConnell necessarily does not render independent claim 15, or any claim that depends on claim 15, unpatentable.

IV. The Proposed Combination Does Not Render Claim 18 Unpatentable

Independent claim 18 recites initiating a call to a Centrex line and initiating a call to a wireless extension of the Centrex line. O'Neil and McConnell both fail to teach this element. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of O'Neil and McConnell necessarily does not render independent claim 18, or any claim that depends on claim 18, unpatentable.

V. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, review of the final rejection is requested. If there are any questions concerning this Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott W. Brim", is written over a horizontal line.

Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200